MARCH 11, 2008

MICHAEL W. DOBBINS CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

| United States of America ex rel. | (MAR 1 1 2008 |
|--|---|
| Kendalė McCoy | } Mar 11, 2008 |
| Full name and prison number) Include name under which convicted) | MICHAEL W. 3 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COUR |
| PETITIONER | CASE NO: (Supplied by Clerk of this Court) |
| vs. Terry L McCann |) 08CV1453 |
| (Warden, Superintendent, or authorized person having custody of petitioner) | JUDGE ANDERSEN |
| RESPONDENT, and | MAG.JUDGE NOLAN |
| (Fill in the following blank <u>only</u> if judgment attacked imposes a sentence to commence in the future) | |
| ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF | Case Number of State Court Conviction: |
| |) 00 cr 8715 |
| (State where judgment entered) | · · |
| PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS C | ORPUS — PERSON IN STATE CUSTODY |
| Name and location of court where conviction entered: | Cook County Court |
| 2600 S California Ave, Chicago Il | 1. 60608 |
| 2. Date of judgment of conviction: December 10. | · |
| | |
| Offense(s) of which petitioner was convicted (list all c First degree murder, 2 counts Arm | · |
| 4. Sentence(s) imposed: 40 years | |
| 5. What was your plea? (Check one) (A) Not gu (B) Guilty (C) Nolo co | ailty (*) contendere () |
| If you pleaded guilty to one count or indictment and n | ot guilty to another count or indictment, give details: |
| NA | |
| | |
| | |

| <u>'A</u> | <u>RT I</u> | TRIAL AND DIKE | T REVIEW | | • | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|---|---|----|
| ι. | , Kind | of trial: (Check one): | Jury (ౖ**) | Judge only () | | |
| 2. | Did | you testify at trial? | YES () NO | O (*) | - | |
| 3. | Did | you appeal from the cor | iviction or the sentence in | posed? YES (*) NO | () | |
| | (A) | (2) Result: | Appellate Court | *** | | |
| | | (3) Date of ruling: | April 16, 2003 | - 3 | | |
| | | (4) Issues raised: | Trial court abus | ed its discretion | when it sentenced | |
| | | the defendant | to 40 years in p | rison | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| | (B) | If you did not appeal, o | explain briefly why not: | | | |
| | (-) | | | | | |
| 4. | | If yes, give the | ve to appeal, to the highest | t state court? YES (*) | NO () | |
| • | rie | - | anuary 28, 2004 | · | | |
| | | | | ' · | <u>ision in affirming</u> court determinati on | |
| | | was entitled t | o great deference | = & will not be | altered absent | |
| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | abuse of discreti | · | | |
| 5. | | | | writ of certiorari? Yes (| | |
| | If ye | es, give (A) date of petiti | ion: (B) (| late <i>certiorari</i> was denied: | <u>'</u> | |
| | s | Where in the entence where t | instant case that here was no physi | abuse is evident cal proof defend | t by such a harsh dant had shot anyone. | |
| | P | The Appellate otential was to ffense. | e Court also erre be given less we | ed in holding defer eight, than the se | endant's rehabilitati eriousness of the | ve |

| PART | II — (| COLLA | TERAL | PRO | <u>CEEDINGS</u> |
|------|---------------|-------|-------|-----|-----------------|
|------|---------------|-------|-------|-----|-----------------|

| A. | Name of cour | t: COOK County Circuit Court |
|----|----------------|---|
| В. | Date of filing | July 27, 2004, July 28, 2004 |
| C. | Issues raised: | ON SEPERATE PAGE (A) |
| • | | |
| D. | Did you recei | ve an evidentiary hearing on your petition? YES () NO (*) |
| B. | What was the | court's ruling? <u>Denied</u> |
| F. | Date of court | 's ruling: September 27, 2004 |
| G. | Did you appe | al from the ruling on your petition? YES (*) NO () |
| H. | (a) If yes, | (1) what was the result? Denied |
| | | (2) date of decision: |
| | (b) If no, exp | plain briefly why not: |
| I. | Did you appe | al, or seek leave to appeal this decision to the highest state court? |
| | YES (*) NO |) () |
| | (a) If yes, | (1) what was the result? Denied |
| | | (2) date of decision: January 24, 2007 |

PART II: COLLATERAL PROCEEDINGS

THAT THE PETITIONER CONTENDS THAT HE WAS DENIED HIS RIGHT TO
A FAIR TRIAL GURANTEED BY THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF
THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION: AND THAT SUCH DENIAL IS NOT REFLECTED
ON THE RECORD OF THE APPEAL OF HIS CONVICTION.

- (a) THAT HE WAS DENIED HIS SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. HIS GURANTEED TO COUNSEL WHILE IN CUSTODY AT THE POLICE STATION:
- (b) THAT PETITIONER'S SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL BEFORE AND DURING TRIAL WERE DENIED BY TRIAL COUNSELS DEFICIENCY: IN THAT, COUNSEL DID NOT PROPERLY INVESTIGATE THIS CASE BEFORE TRIAL AND WAS THEREFORE NOT PREPARED FOR THE CONDUCT OF A TRIAL FAILING TO MEET HIS SIXTH AMENDMENT OBLIGATION TO PETITIONER AS PRESCRIBED BY THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:
- (c) PETITIONER'S CONTENTION THAT HE WAS DENIED A FAIR TRIAL DUE TO PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT BEFORE AND DURING TRIAL:
- (d) PETITIONER CONTENDS THAT HE WAS DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL AS A RESULT OF THE PROSECUTOR'S KEY WITNESS THEON JONES PERJURED TESTIMONY BEFORE THE GRAND JURY AND DURING TRIAL
- (e) THAT PETITIONER'S VIDEO TAPED CONFESSION WAS COERCED AND SHOULD HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED;
- (f) THAT PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO TESTIFY DURING TRIAL THROUGH THE INEFFECTIVENESS OF TRIAL COUNSEL;

THAT BECAUSE OF THE AFOREMENTIONED SUBSTANTIAL DENIAL OF PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL, THE JUDGEMENTAND SENTENCE OF CONVICTION SHOULD BE VACATED AND SET ASIDE AND A NEW TRIAL SHOULD BE ORDERED.

| л. | If yes, give the following information | with respect to es | ach proceedin | ng (use separat | sheets if n | ecessary): |
|------------|--|--|------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | 1. Nature of proceeding | . | - | | | |
| | 2. Date petition filed | | | 1 | | |
| | 3. Ruling on the petition | <u> </u> | | | | · · |
| | 3. Date of ruling | | | : | | |
| | 4. If you appealed, what was the ruling on appeal? | | - - - - | | 1 | |
| | 5. Date of ruling on appeal | | | , | | |
| • | 6. If there was a further appeal, what was the ruling? | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 7. Date of ruling on appeal | n have you filed | | etition for habe | ue cornie i | r federal court? |
| 3. Wit | 7. Date of ruling on appeal h respect to this conviction or sentence YES () NO (*) If yes, give name of court, case title | | | etition for habe | · | |
| | h respect to this conviction or sentence YES () NO (*) | and case number: | | | · | |
| A . | h respect to this conviction or sentence YES () NO (*) If yes, give name of court, case title | and case number: | | | · | |
| A . | h respect to this conviction or sentence YES () NO (*) If yes, give name of court, case title Did the court rule on your petition? | and case number: | | | · | |
| A. B. | h respect to this conviction or sentence YES () NO (*) If yes, give name of court, case title Did the court rule on your petition? (1) Ruling: | and case number: If so, state N OR SENTENC | • | | ı | i |
| A. B. | h respect to this conviction or sentence YES () NO (*) If yes, give name of court, case title Did the court rule on your petition? (1) Ruling: (2) Date: THRESPECT TO THIS CONVICTION OTHER THAN THIS PE | and case number: If so, state N OR SENTENC | • | | ı | i |

PART III - PETITIONER'S CLAIMS

1. State <u>briefly</u> every ground on which you claim that you are being held unlawfully. Summarize <u>briefly</u> the <u>facts</u> supporting each ground. You may attach additional pages stating additional grounds and supporting facts. If you fail to set forth all grounds in this petition, you may be barred from presenting additional grounds later.

BEFORE PROCEEDING IN THE FEDERAL COURT, YOU MUST ORDINARILY FIRST EXHAUST YOUR STATE COURT REMEDIES WITH RESPECT TO EACH GROUND FOR RELIEF ASSERTED.

| (A ₎ | Supporting facts (tell your story briefly without citing cases or law): |
|-----------------|---|
| | THE STATE APPELLATE DEFENDER'S MOTION REQUESTING LEAVE TO WITHDRAW |
| | AS COUNSEL, WHEN IT WAS OBJECTIVELY UNREASONABLE FOR APPELLATE COUNSE |
| | NOT TO PRESENT ON APPEAL THE SUFFICIENCY OF POST TRIAL CLAIMS, WHEN |
| | THE CIRCUIT COURT ERRED, WHEN IT SUMMARILY DISMISSED DEFENDANT'S |
| | PETITION WITHOUT APPOINTING COUNSEL TO INVESTIGATE THE CONTENTIONS |
| | OF DEFENDANT'S POST CONVICTION CLAIMS, RESEARCH THE LAW OR AMENDIING |
| | THE PETITION TO CRAFT A MORE PROPER PLEADING FOR THE COURTS REVIEW. |
| : | CONTINUED PG. B |
| (B) | Ground two |
| | Supporting facts: |
| • | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

AS A "GIST" OF MERITORIOUS CLAIM WAS PRESENTED BY THE DEFENDANT IN HIS PETITION FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF, WHICH IS ALL THAT IS REQUIRED AT THE FIRST STAGE OF THE POST CONVICTION ACT.

THERE ARE COMPELLING REASONS TO GRANT REVIEW WHERE DEFENDANT

TOOK AN APPEAL FROM SUMMARY DISMISSAL OF HIS PETITION FOR POST

CONVICTION RELIEF, AND DEFENDANT'S APPELLATE COUNSEL FILED A MOTION

TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL PURSUANT TO Pennsylvania v Finley, 481 U.S.

551, 95 L ed 2d 539, 107 S. ct 1990 (1987)

INFORMING THE APPELLATE COURT THAT AFTER REVIEWING THE RECORD AND

FACTS IN THIS CASE AND APPLICABLE LAW, COUNSEL FOUND NO ISSUES IN

THIS CASE WHICH WOULD HAVE MERITED RELIEF IN THE APPELLATE COURT,

THE APPELLATE COURT APPLIED AN UNREASONABLE APPLICATION OF THIS COURTS

HOLDING IN People v Gaultney, 174 ILL. 2d 410 (1996); People v coleman

183 Ill 2d 366 (1998); People V Edwards , 197 ILL. 2d 239 (2001);

WHEN IT HELD THAT IT FOUND NO ISSUES OF ARGUABLE MERIT TO BE ASSERTED ON APPEAL.

IT WAS OBJECTIVELY UNREASONABLE FOR THE APPELLATE COUNSEL NOT
TO PRESENT ON APPEAL THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE POST CONVICTION CLAIMS
OF INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR A VARIETY OF SEPERATE ALLEGATIONS
PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT AND INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF APPELLATE
COUNSEL, AND THAT THE CIRCUIT COURT ERRED WHEN IT SUMMARILY DISMISSED
DEFENDANT'S PETITION WITHOUT APPOINTING COUNSEL.

THE RELEVANT QUESTION IS WHETHER THE PETITION IS FRIVOLOUS OR

PATENTLY WITHOUT MERIT, 725 ILCS 5/ 122-2.1 (A) (2)'

People v edwards, 197 Ill. 2d 239 (2001); WHETHER THE PETITION AND

ANY ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS MAKE A SUBSTANTIAL SHOWING OF A CONSTITUTIONAL

VIOLATION IS SECOND STAGE INQUIORY(Edwards, 197 ILL. 2d at 245-46 (2001)

A PRO SE POST CONVICTION MAY NOT BE DISMISSED WITHOUT APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL UNLESS IT IS FRIVOLOUS OR PATENTLY WITHOUT MERIT . (725 ILCS 5/122-2.1 (A). IF NO SUCH FINDING MAY BE PROPERLY MADE, THE TRIALCOURT MUST PROVIDE AN INDIGENT PETITIONER WITH APPOINTED COUNSEL (725 ILCS 5/122-4) TO BE SUFFICIENT TO REQUIRE APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL A POST CONVICTION NEED NOT CONTAIN LEGAL ARGUMENTS NOR CITATIONS TO LEGAL AUTHORITY. People v Porter, 122 ILL. 2d 64 (1988).

IN ORDER TO SURVIVE DISMISSAL AT THE PRO SE PETITION AT THE FIRST STAGE, NEED ONLY CONTAIN A STATEMENT WHICH PRESENTS A "GIST" OF A MERITORIOUS CLAIM. People v Gaultney, 174 ILL. 2d 410 (1996); People V Coleman, 183 ILL. 2d 366 (1998); THE PETITION ONLY NEED PRESENT A LIMITED AMOUNT OF DETAIL IN THE PETITION, BECAUSE OF A LOW THRESHHOLD FOR EVALUATING THE PETITION, People v Gaultney, 174 ILL. 2d 410 (1996):AND SHOULD BE CONSTRUED LIBERALLY IN FAVOR OF PETITIONER WHERE INARTFULLY DRAFTED. People v Coleman, 183, ILL. 2d 366 (1998) SUBSTANTIVE QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE PETITION ARE NOT TO BE ADRESSED AT THE FIRST STAGE OF THE POST CONVICTION PROCEEDINGS, People v Topps, 309 ILL. App. 3d 813 (1999).

THEREFORE, THE TRUST OF THE INSTANT CHALLENGE IS WHETHER THE RECORD REFLECTS SUFFICIENT FACTS TO SUPPORT THE ALLEGATIONS SO ASTO APPOINT COUNSEL WHO WOULD REPRESENT & INVESTIGATE THE CONTENTIONS,

RESEARCH THE LAW, OR AMEND THE PETITION AND CRAFT A MORE PROPER PLEADING FOR THE COURTS REVIEW. Edwards, 197 ILL. 2d at 270 (2001)

APPELLATE COUNSEL'S FAILURE TO PRESENT THIS ISSUE ON APPEAL SUCH DECISION PREJUDICED DEFENDANT, People v Enis, 194 ILL. 2d at 377 (2000). THE TWO PRONG TEST APPLIES TO CLAIMS OF INEFFECTIVENESS OF APPELLATE COUNSEL AS WELL. People v Gaballero, 126 ILL. 248, 269-70 (1989).

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THIS HONORABLE COURT GRANT HIS PETITION.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

KENDALE MCCOY K 59039

STATEVILLE CORR. CTR.P.O BOX 112

JOLIET ILL. 60434

PRO SE PETITIONER DEFENDANT

| (C) | Ground three Supporting facts: | | · · · · | • | | | | | (- 1) |
|------|--|-------------------|---|--------------|-----------|----------|-------------|-------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| • | , <u>1 - 111 -</u> | , | | | | | | | |
| | | | · • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | | - | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | • | | | , | | 1 | ••• |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| (D) | Ground four | " | | | | | | | |
| (-) | Supporting facts: | - | , | | | | ÷ | | |
| | ı | · · | | | | | 10.0 | | |
| | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | , | | <u> </u> | | |
| | | • | | | | | | | |
| | | , | | . | | | | | <u>.</u> |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Have | all grounds raised in the YES (X) NO () | nis petition been | presented to | the hig | thest cou | rt havir | ig jurisdic | tion? | |
| | | | briefly wh | | | | | | not: |

PART IV - REPRESENTATION

| Give the | name | and | address, | if | known, | of | each | attorney | who | represer | ited | you | in t | ne | following | stages | of t | he | judgment |
|----------|---------|-----|----------|-----|--------|----|------|----------|------|----------|-------|-------------|------|----|-----------|--------|------|----|----------|
| attacked | herein: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) | A | 1:: | | -i- | ~ FDA | | 1 11 | onto - | - PI | Blic D | CE to | <i>አ/በይ</i> | 15 | KL | ETTE | | | | |

| (A) | At preliminary hearing FRANK MADEA - PUBLIC DEFENDERS OF FILE |
|----------|---|
| (B) | At arraignment and plea 2650 S. CAUFORMA CHICAGO II. 60608 |
| (C) | At trial (SAME AS ABOVE) |
| (D) | At sentencing (SAME AS ABOVE) |
| | On appeal MARK Floyd PASTERSKI - 69 W. WASHINGTON 15TH F. Chgo. Fl. 40602 |
| | In any post-conviction proceeding PRO - SE |
| | Other (state): KERRY GOETTSCH - ASSISTMUT APPELLATE DEFENDER 203 NORTH LASALLE ST. 24TH Fl. CH90. Fl. 60601 |
| PART V | - FUTURE SENTENCE |
| Do you l | have any future sentence to serve following the sentence imposed by this conviction? |
| YES (|) NO (X) |
| Name ar | nd location of the court which imposed the sentence: |
| Date and | I length of sentence to be served in the future |
| | EREFORE, petitioner prays that the court grant petitioner all relief to which he may be entitled in this proceeding |
| Signed o | on: /-22-68' (Date) Signature of attorney (if any) |
| | I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. |

(Signature of petitioner)

Joliet II. 60434

REVISED 01/01/2001